

SCIPP 92/21

June 1992

T

ELECTROWEAK BARYOGENESIS:
AN OVERVIEW (WHERE ARE WE NOW?)

MICHAEL DINE

*Santa Cruz Institute for Particle Physics
University of California, Santa Cruz, CA 95064*

ABSTRACT

It now seems plausible that the observed baryon asymmetry may have been produced at the electroweak phase transition. We review the considerations which lead to this conclusion, focusing on the obstacles to making reliable estimates. These arise from incomplete knowledge of baryon-violating rates near the phase transition, our limited understanding of the phase transition itself, and incomplete understanding of the mechanisms which actually lead to an asymmetry.

Invited Lecture

Texas Symposium on Electroweak Baryon Number Violation
Yale University, March 1992.

★ Work supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy.

1. Introduction

In principle, the three conditions for baryogenesis enunciated by Sakharov can all be met by electroweak physics. Baryon number is badly violated by the electroweak theory at temperatures at or above the electroweak phase transition. The weak phase transition itself can be first order, providing a departure from equilibrium. Substantial CP violation can be provided by extensions of the minimal standard model, such as supersymmetric and multi-Higgs theories.[†] Indeed, provided that the transition is actually first order, it is clear that one will necessarily produce some baryon number at the transition. In this talk I will attempt to survey our current ability to calculate the asymmetry which arises in any given extension of the standard model. Corresponding to Sakharov's three conditions, this problem has three aspects: computing the rate for baryon number violation in different environments; determining the nature of the phase transition as a function of the underlying theory; understanding precisely which non-equilibrium processes are most important to generating the asymmetry, and computing their contributions.

Before discussing detailed analyses, we should first ask: why is the prospect of electroweak baryogenesis interesting? There are at least two answers. First, the ties between cosmology and experimentally accessible particle physics are very limited. It would be very satisfying if at some stage we could use experimental measurements of microscopic parameters to predict or explain the abundance of matter. It would be even more dramatic if, by insisting that the baryon asymmetry be of electroweak origin, we could make predictions for future particle experiments. Second, there is a more theoretical concern, which is that such late production of the asymmetry may ameliorate some of the problems of inflationary cosmology, particularly problems connected with reheating. On the other hand, electroweak baryogenesis is unlikely to leave observable astrophysical signals (apart from matter itself). At this temperature, for example, there are only about 10^{17} baryons within a horizon volume.

2. Baryon Number Violation in the Standard Model at High Temperature

The possibility that effects associated with the anomaly might be enhanced at high temperature, and that this might have importance for the baryon asymmetry was suggested early on by Linde²⁾ and by Dimopoulos and Susskind.³⁾ Klinkhammer and Manton, in their original work on sphalerons, argued that B violation would be enhanced at high temperature (but not at high energies).⁴⁾

[†] Shaposhnikov has made a number of exotic suggestions as to how KM phases might yield a large enough asymmetry. See, for example, reference 1.

However, the first to really explore this possibility in a serious way were Kuzmin, Rubakov and Shaposhnikov.⁵⁾ These authors estimated the rates for B violation in the broken phase of the theory, and considered possible ramifications. In particular, they noted that these effects could modify or wipe out any pre-existing baryon number, and that the electroweak transition itself might be the origin of the baryon number if it is first order.

The basic ideas underlying these phenomena are very simple. While the lagrangian of the standard model preserves B and L at the classical level, both suffer from an anomaly, and are not strictly conserved ($B - L$ is free of anomalies). For example,

$$\partial_\mu j^\mu B = \frac{3g_2^2}{16\pi^2} F\tilde{F}. \quad (1.1)$$

$F\tilde{F}$ can itself be written as a total divergence,

$$F\tilde{F} = \partial_\mu K^\mu \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$K^\mu = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} Tr(A_\nu \partial_\rho A_\sigma + \frac{2}{3} A_\nu A_\rho A_\sigma). \quad (1.3)$$

The zero component of K is known as the Chern-Simons number, n_{CS} . This number plays a special role in gauge theories. In a theory without fermions, there are classically an infinite set of zero energy states labeled by n_{CS} . In the standard model, as a consequence of the anomaly, states of different n_{CS} differ also in their baryon number. Thus states of different baryon number are separated from one another by continuous changes in bosonic fields. At low energies, one can pass from one such state to another by tunneling. The corresponding amplitude was computed by 't Hooft,⁶⁾ using instanton methods, and is – as expected of a tunneling amplitude in a weakly coupled theory – exponentially small,

$$\Gamma \sim e^{-4\pi/\alpha_W}. \quad (1.4)$$

It is natural to ask whether the tunneling rate is enhanced at high temperatures and energies. The question of high energy enhancement will be the subject of the second half of this meeting. I have expressed my views – that the cross section grows exponentially with energy for some range of energy, but is always exponentially small – on this controversial subject elsewhere⁷⁾ and will not elaborate them again here. At high temperatures, however, it is now widely accepted that the rate becomes large. This is readily understood by considering an analogy with a system with a single degree of freedom (see fig. 1).⁸⁾ The system possesses a metastable minimum, in which the curvature of the potential is ω^2 ; the barrier

between this minimum and the true minimum has height V_o . For such a system at zero temperature, in the classical limit one can perform a WKB analysis, giving an exponential suppression. For temperatures large compare to the curvature in the metastable minimum, ω^2 , one can apply classical statistical mechanics to see that the barrier penetration rate goes as $e^{-\beta V_o}$. The analogs of the metastable minimum in the electroweak theory are states centered around different integer values of n_{CS} . The point at the top of the barrier is the “sphaleron,”⁴⁾ a static solution of the classical equations of motion with a single unstable mode. The barrier height is just the sphaleron energy,

$$E_{sp} = AM_W T / \alpha_W \quad (1.5)$$

corresponding to a transition rate

$$\Gamma \propto e^{-AM_W / (\alpha_W T)}. \quad (1.6)$$

All of this is for temperatures below the critical temperature for the electroweak phase transition, T_c . For higher temperatures $M_W = 0$, and it is believed that the rate behaves as^{9,10)}

$$\Gamma = \kappa (\alpha_W T)^4. \quad (1.7)$$

This result can easily be understood in a heuristic way as follows. The high temperature theory is essentially an unbroken gauge theory in $2 + 1$ dimensions. It is believed that such a system has a correlation length (“magnetic mass” or “magnetic screening length”)

$$\zeta \sim (\alpha_W T)^{-1}. \quad (1.8)$$

Return to the zero temperature, four dimensional theory, and consider a pure gauge instanton with scale size ρ . Such an instanton can be viewed as parameterizing a path in field space starting in a state with one value of n_{CS} and ending in another, as the “imaginary time” varies from $-\infty$ to ∞ . (see fig. 2). For a given value of ρ , the highest energy point along this path has energy E_b , where, on dimensional grounds, $E_b \sim 1/(\alpha_W \rho)$. The largest allowed ρ gives the smallest barrier. Since one clearly can’t have $\rho \gg \zeta$, the trajectory with the lowest possible barrier has $E_b \sim T$. As a result, there is no exponential suppression of the rate. The rest of eq. (1.7) follows on dimensional grounds. In their earlier work on this subject, Arnold and McLerran found, from heuristic considerations, that κ could be expected to be of order 10 or so.⁹⁾

This whole picture has received support from a number of sources. Arnold and McLerran⁹⁾ were among the first to take the suggestion of Kuzmin *et al.* seriously. In their work they addressed many issues, including the problem of calculating the

prefactor in eq. (1.6). By studying a number of illustrative toy models, they were also able to resolve a number of puzzles. In particular, they understood how one could have large transition rates while at the same time having exponentially small θ -dependence. Skepticism was further damped by the numerical work of Grigoriev, Rubakov and Shaposhnikov on the Abelian Higgs model in $1 + 1$ dimensions. At finite volume, this theory has a structure very similar to four dimensional Yang Mills theory. Classical zero energy states are solutions of the equation

$$D_1\phi = 0. \tag{1.9}$$

With periodic boundary conditions, these are of the form

$$\phi = \phi_o e^{2\pi i n/L} \qquad A_1 = 2\pi n/L.$$

The Chern-Simons number in this theory is very simple:

$$n_{CS} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int dx A_1 = n. \tag{1.10}$$

This theory admits sphalerons and instantons quite analogous to those in $3 + 1$ dimensions, and one can estimate the transition rate as discussed in refs. 5 and 9.

In order to verify if this picture is really correct, Grigoriev *et al.* simulated the system numerically. The basic idea in their approach is to note first that at high temperatures the system should be described by classical statistical mechanics. Moreover, for sufficiently large volume, the evolution of a given classical configuration should be ergodic, given that the system is non-linear. Thus they picked field configurations from a statistically generated ensemble, and simply followed their evolution for long periods of time. As one can see in fig. 3, the results are quite striking. n_{CS} makes small, rapid oscillations about integer values for some period of time, and then less frequently makes integer jumps. The rates for these integer jumps are consistent with sphaleron estimates. Moreover, if one follows the scalar field during one of these jumps, one sees that it “unwinds” precisely as one expects (see fig. 4; note that the field develops a zero as it must for non-singular evolution). Closer study of these results reveals many satisfying features. The rate and amplitude of the small oscillations, for example, can easily be estimated and is consistent with the numerical results. Overall, the picture is quite compelling.

Further progress has also been made in understanding the four dimensional situation. In particular, Carson, Li, McLerran and Wang¹²⁾ have evaluated the functional determinant about the sphaleron, which determines the prefactor. For

example, for a single Higgs with self coupling of order one, the rate is given by

$$\Gamma = \gamma \alpha_2^{-3} M_W^7 e^{-E_{sp}/T}. \quad (1.11)$$

Simulations in four dimensions, of course, are more difficult. It is particularly important, as we will see, to determine the rate in the high temperature phase. Ambjorn *et al.* have attempted to simulate the high temperature rate in a manner similar to the $1+1$ calculations.¹³⁾ Again one observes that n_{CS} makes discrete jumps; the simulations yield values for κ in the range 0.1–1.0. While the results are impressive, they are (not surprisingly) not quite as convincing as the one dimensional calculations. They are, for example, a good deal noisier. This results, in part, from the fact that if one simply computes the correlation function for n_{CS} in perturbation theory, it exhibits both infrared and ultraviolet sensitivity. Moreover, these authors are not able to observe the expected $\sqrt{t}$ growth in n_{CS} . Finally, the interpretation of their results is complicated by the fact that they considered a theory with Higgs fields. Improved simulations, both with and without Higgs fields, are very important, since, as we will see, the baryon asymmetry which arises in any model is roughly proportional to κ . Heuristic models such as that of ref. 9 and one to be discussed below suggest that κ could be as large as 10 to 100.

3. The Phase Transition in the Minimal Standard Model

One might expect that the weak phase transition in the minimal standard model would be completely understood by now, given that the subject has been studied for over 20 years, and was indeed the first setting in which phase transitions in relativistic quantum field theories were considered.¹⁴⁾ Yet surprisingly, many questions which turn out to be of great importance for computing the baryon asymmetry remain unsettled. In the literature, one finds what we might refer to as the “usual” picture of the phase transition: the gauge symmetry is unbroken at low T , unbroken for large T .^{14,15)} To derive this picture, one computes the (finite temperature) effective potential, $V(\phi, T)$, at one loop. Since a theory with a single light Higgs doublet already exhibits a first order phase transition, we will consider this case first. Contributions of particles of mass $m(\phi)$ to $V(\phi, T)$ are proportional to $m^2 T^2$, $m^3 T$ and $m^4 \ln(m/T)$. We will assume that the Higgs boson mass is smaller than the masses of W and Z bosons and the top quark, $m_H < m_W, m_Z, m_t$. Therefore we will neglect the Higgs boson contribution to $V(\phi, T)$.

The zero temperature potential, taking into account one-loop corrections, is given by¹⁵⁾

$$V_0 = -\frac{\mu^2}{2}\phi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4}\phi^4 + 2Bv_o^2\phi^2 - \frac{3}{2}B\phi^4 + B\phi^4 \ln\left(\frac{\phi^2}{v_o^2}\right). \quad (3.1)$$

Here

$$B = \frac{3}{64\pi^2 v_o^4} (2m_W^4 + m_Z^4 - 4m_t^4) , \quad (3.2)$$

$v_o = 246$ GeV is the value of the scalar field at the minimum of V_0 , $\lambda = \mu^2/v_o^2$, $m_H^2 = 2\mu^2$. At a finite temperature, one should add to this expression the term

$$V_T = \frac{T^4}{2\pi^2} [6I_-(y_W) + 3I_-(y_Z) - 6I_+(y_t)] , \quad (3.3)$$

where $y_i = M_i \phi / v_o T$, and

$$I_{\mp}(y) = \pm \int_0^{\infty} dx \, x^2 \ln \left(1 \mp e^{-\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}} \right) . \quad (3.4)$$

In the high temperature limit it is sufficient to use an approximate expression for $V(\phi, T)$ ^{14,16)}

$$V(\phi, T) = D(T^2 - T_o^2)\phi^2 - ET\phi^3 + \frac{\lambda_T}{4}\phi^4 . \quad (3.5)$$

Here

$$D = \frac{1}{8v_o^2} (2m_W^2 + m_Z^2 + 2m_t^2) , \quad (3.6)$$

$$E = \frac{1}{4\pi v_o^3} (2m_W^3 + m_Z^3) \sim 10^{-2} , \quad (3.7)$$

$$T_o^2 = \frac{1}{2D} (\mu^2 - 4Bv_o^2) = \frac{1}{4D} (m_H^2 - 8Bv_o^2) , \quad (3.8)$$

$$\lambda_T = \lambda - \frac{3}{16\pi^2 v_o^4} \left(2m_W^4 \ln \frac{m_W^2}{a_B T^2} + m_Z^4 \ln \frac{m_Z^2}{a_B T^2} - 4m_t^4 \ln \frac{m_t^2}{a_F T^2} \right) , \quad (3.9)$$

where $\ln a_B = 2 \ln 4\pi - 2\gamma \simeq 3.91$, $\ln a_F = 2 \ln \pi - 2\gamma \simeq 1.14$.

This potential leads to a phase transition which is at least weakly first order, basically as a consequence of the term cubic in ϕ . At very high temperatures, V has a unique minimum at $\phi = 0$. As the temperature is decreased, a second minimum appears at a temperature

$$T_1 = \frac{T_0}{1 - 9E^2/8\lambda_T D} . \quad (3.10)$$

At a temperature T_c , this new minimum becomes degenerate with the minimum

at the origin; T_c and the corresponding minimum of the potential ϕ_c are given by

$$T_c^2 = \frac{T_o^2}{1 - E^2/\lambda D} \quad \phi_c = 2ET_C/\lambda T_c. \quad (3.11)$$

Finally, at T_0 , the minimum at the origin disappears, and the potential has a unique minimum.

One might expect then that the phase transition would proceed through the formation of bubbles at some temperature between T_c and T_0 ,^{18,19)} and that the study of the evolution of these bubbles would be straightforward. In the standard approach to the computation of finite temperature nucleation rates²⁰⁾ one determines the structure of the critical bubble by looking for stationary points of the classical action which tend to zero at large $|\vec{x}|$ and some non-zero constant for small $|\vec{x}|$; the rate of bubble production is then given by the associated Boltzmann factor, $e^{-S_{cl}\beta}$. As one approaches T_c from below, S_{cl} tends to ∞ . The expansion rate at this time is very small, so at some slightly lower temperature ($T = .98T_c$ or so), when the action is still quite large ($S_{cl} \sim 140$) the universe fills with bubbles. Early work of Linde²⁰⁾ suggests that the bubbles will be rather slow and thick in the case that the weak transition is weakly first order, as it is for a Higgs with mass comparable to the present LEP limits.

While this picture may be simple and appealing, there are many unsettled issues and a good deal of controversy surrounding almost all aspects of the phase transition. Indeed, questions have been raised about the order and nature of the phase transition, and, assuming that the phase transition is first order, widely disparate results have been obtained for the properties of the bubbles. The discussion which follows will focus largely on the phase transition in the minimal theory. As we will see, for a variety of reasons, this theory cannot be relevant to electroweak baryogenesis; still, given its simplicity, it is a useful prototype, and the analyses described here can readily be extended to other theories.

Let us consider first the question of the order of the phase transition. We have noted that the ϕ^3 term in the potential is crucial to the first order nature found at one loop. However, the presence of this ϕ^3 term is itself an indication of an infrared problem. The expression for $V(\phi, T)$ [eq. (3.3)] is formally a function of $|\phi|^2$. However, the expansion in powers of ϕ^2 breaks down at order ϕ^4 . In terms of Feynman graphs, the diagram of fig. 5 diverges linearly (the zero frequency term in the corresponding sum has a divergent momentum integral). The existence of such a term raises the question of what happens in higher orders. Recently, Brahm and Hsu²¹⁾ and Shaposhnikov¹⁾ have investigated aspects of this question. Their investigations yielded puzzling – and opposite – conclusions. Both found terms of order $g^3\phi$ in the potential at two-loop order. However, their answers differed in sign: Brahm and Hsu found a positive term, which tends to render the transition

second order, while Shaposhnikov found a negative sign, which tends to make the transition more strongly first order. Clearly both results cannot be correct – and in fact these authors have all conceded some errors. However, the errors turn out to be subtle, and this work points out the need for an improved understanding of the perturbation expansion. P. Huet, R. Leigh, A. Linde and I have pursued these questions thoroughly.²⁴⁾ We have shown that through two-loop order there are no linear terms and that perturbation theory is under control. However, we have also shown that the coefficient of the cubic term is reduced by higher order corrections to 2/3 of its one-loop value. This tends to make the phase transition more weakly first order. In particular, this observation plus the present limits on the Higgs mass from LEP completely rule out models with a single Higgs doublet (even with injections of additional CP violation) as the source of the baryon asymmetry. The problem (as originally stressed by Shaposhnikov²²⁾) is that for a Higgs of mass 55 GeV or larger, the Higgs vev after the phase transition is significantly less than T , and the baryon violation rate is larger than the expansion rate. Thus any pre-existing asymmetry is wiped out. These topics are discussed at greater length in the talks by R. Leigh, A. Linde, D. Brahm and S. Hsu at this meeting.

While the perturbation expansion is in reasonable shape, in the sense that there are no unmanageable infrared problems, one can ask whether it is really a good guide, *i.e.*, whether for the temperatures of interest the higher order corrections are numerically small. It is not hard to evaluate the leading two-loop corrections (involving strong and weak couplings) to the quadratic term in the potential and these tend to be of order 20%.²⁵⁾

Even granted the (corrected) one-loop potential, questions have been raised about how the transition actually proceeds. Kolb and Gleiser²⁶⁾ and Tetradis²⁷⁾ have raised questions about the standard picture of bubble formation. The basic idea is that, if the transition is very weakly first order, then, even above T_c , fluctuations are so large that the system can not be said to lie in one state or another, but rather the universe consists of a sort of emulsion of the two phases. This quasi-equilibrium of the two phases, they argue, is maintained by “subcritical bubbles,” bubbles smaller than the critical bubbles obtained from the analysis above. Certainly it is true that if the transition is sufficiently weakly first order, the true and false vacuum will be separated by an amount which is small compared to typical fluctuations in the fields. Linde will argue, in his talk, that if one simply examines the typical fluctuations in these modes, one finds that for any transition which is sufficiently strongly first order to generate the baryon asymmetry, the conventional analysis is correct; fluctuations are just not so large.

All of this suggests that for some range of parameters, the phase transition in the minimal standard model – and modest extensions of it – will be first order. Thus there is hope to produce an appreciable baryon asymmetry at the electroweak

transition. Any asymmetry will be produced near the walls of the expanding bubbles, for it is here that there are significant departures from equilibrium. A typical bubble will grow to a macroscopic size before colliding with other bubbles. Thus it is necessary to understand how the bubbles propagate through the hot plasma. Naively, one expects that the wall will be slowed by particles such as top quarks, W 's and Z 's, which gain appreciable mass in the broken phase.²⁰⁾ If the wall is thin compared to typical mean free paths, these particles will transfer a (velocity-dependent) amount of momentum to the wall, yielding a non-relativistic terminal velocity. In simple models, however, the wall tends to be thick; the velocity is likely to be substantially larger but the analysis becomes more complicated. Indeed, Turok²⁸⁾ argued at one stage that the wall might become ultrarelativistic. More recently, McLerran and Turok²⁹⁾ and Huet *et al.*,²⁴⁾ have made estimates yielding wall velocities varying from about 0.2 to 0.8. (These are discussed in Leigh's talk at this meeting). These analyses also yield values for the wall thickness: for a 35 GeV Higgs, for example, one finds $\ell \sim 40 T^{-1}$. However, the study of the wall motion is still a quite primitive stage, and these results may be incomplete, in the sense that potentially important (possibly dominant) effects have not been accounted for.

To conclude this section, I would like to return to the question of bounds on the Higgs mass mentioned above. Shaposhnikov²²⁾ has stressed that one needs the transition to be sufficiently first order that once ϕ settles to its minimum, $\Gamma(\phi) \ll H$; otherwise, the baryon number which has been generated will disappear (unless $B - L$ is not conserved in the process³⁰⁾). Shaposhnikov found a limit of about 45 GeV. Allowing for the corrections to the potential which have been described above, and making generous estimates of the uncertainties in the various calculations,²³⁾ one finds a limit between 33 and 41 GeV. Thus one needs to find models with a more strongly first order transition. In multi-Higgs models, detailed analyses show that the limits are significantly weakened.^{31,32)} These analyses are rather complicated, however, and Hall and Anderson¹⁶⁾ have provided a much simpler example which gives an "existence proof" that Higgs with mass over 100 GeV could be responsible for baryogenesis. The idea is simply to take the single Higgs model, and add a light scalar singlet, S , with couplings

$$V_S = M^2 S^* S + 2\zeta^2 S^* S H^* H + \lambda_S (S^* S)^2. \quad (3.12)$$

This scalar has two effects:

- a. if it is sufficiently light – in practice, 150 GeV or so – it increases the magnitude of the cubic term in the finite-temperature potential;
- b. the presence of S modifies (through loop effects) the relation between the Higgs mass and the quartic coupling.

Indeed, Hall and Anderson find that it is quite easy to accommodate a 150 GeV Higgs in this framework. One needn't take this model too seriously, but it

does suggest that if the electroweak transition is the origin of matter, the Higgs sector may exhibit significant structure at relatively low energies.

4. Producing the Baryon Asymmetry

We have now seen that the weak phase transition may well be first order, and that baryon number is badly violated at high temperatures. The minimal standard model violates CP, and most extensions of the minimal model violate CP more strongly. Thus provided that the electroweak transition is indeed first order, we are pretty much guaranteed to produce an asymmetry; the question is how large is the asymmetry. We would like to be in the position that, given a particular model we could simply calculate the baryon to photon ratio as a function of the model parameters. In this section, I will describe some of the scenarios which have been proposed for producing the asymmetry. We will see that there are a number of mechanisms which might plausibly produce an adequate n_B/n_γ , but that the calculations still have large uncertainties.

The simplest – if perhaps least efficient – situation arises when the effective theory at the weak transition contains only a single Higgs doublet.¹⁸⁾ In this case, apart from the usual KM phases, various higher dimension CP-violating operators may arise from integrating out physics at higher scales. This physics might be supersymmetry, some version of technicolor, a multi-Higgs model, or something else. The lowest dimension CP-violating bosonic operator one can write in this case is

$$\mathcal{L}_{CP} = \frac{g^4 \sin(\delta)}{64\pi^2 M^2} |\phi|^2 F \tilde{F} \quad (4.1)$$

where $\sin(\delta)$ is a measure of CP violation, and M represents the scale of new physics. Using the anomaly equation, this may be rewritten

$$\mathcal{L}_{CP} = \frac{g^2 \sin(\delta)}{12M^2} |\phi|^2 \partial_\mu j^\mu B. \quad (4.2)$$

Now during the phase transition, ϕ is changing in time near the bubble walls. Suppose ϕ changes slowly in time, and can be viewed as nearly homogeneous in space (it is not hard to modify this analysis for the more realistic case where spatial gradients are somewhat larger than the time derivatives). Then we may rewrite the interaction term as

$$\mathcal{L}_{CP} = \frac{g^2 \sin(\delta)}{12M^2} \partial_0 |\phi|^2 n_B.$$

If ϕ is varying slowly enough, this term is like a chemical potential for baryon number, n_B , and the minimum of the free energy is shifted away from zero, in a

manner similar to the “spontaneous baryogenesis” picture of Cohen and Kaplan³³⁾ An elementary calculation gives for the location of the new minimum

$$n_B^o = \mathcal{L}_{CP} = \frac{g^2 \sin(\delta)}{48M^2} \partial_0 |\phi|^2. \quad (4.3)$$

Since baryon number is violated, the system tries to get to this minimum. One can easily obtain a rate equation by detailed balance

$$\frac{dn_B}{dt} = -18\Gamma(t)T^{-3}[n_B - n_B^o(t)]. \quad (4.4)$$

Note that the result is sensible: the rate vanishes at the minimum; it is proportional to Γ and the number of quark doublets.

Assuming that the time variation of the scalar field is small, we can make an adiabatic approximation, *i.e.*, , we can assume that everything is in equilibrium except n_B itself. In this approximation, $\Gamma(t)$ is determined by the instantaneous value of ϕ , *i.e.*, ,

$$\Gamma(t) = \Gamma[\phi(t)] \sim e^{-Am_W(\phi)/(\alpha_W T)}. \quad (4.5)$$

This turns off for $M_W \sim \alpha_W T$, and can potentially give a large suppression. To get a crude estimate of the asymmetry, take

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma &= \kappa(\alpha_W T)^4 \quad M_W < \sigma \alpha_W T \\ &= 0 \quad M_W > \sigma \alpha_W T \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where σ is an unknown numerical constant, about which we will comment below. It is now a trivial matter to solve the rate equation, and obtain

$$\frac{n_B}{n_\gamma} = \alpha_W^6 \frac{3\sigma^2 T^2 \sin(\delta) \kappa}{g^* M^2}. \quad (4.7)$$

Here g^* is the number of light degrees of freedom at the phase transition (of order 100). α_W^6 is already of order 10^{-9} , so to have any chance of obtaining the observed asymmetry in such a model, one needs $T \sim M$, maximal CP violation, and good luck with κ and σ .

It is not so obvious how to extend the analysis described above to the case where $T \gg M$; on the other hand this is precisely the situation of interest. It is also the situation considered by McLerran *et al.* in their work on the two-Higgs model.¹⁹⁾ For general choices of the parameters in the Higgs potential, a two-Higgs

model violates CP.[★] In this theory, the fermions are massless in the unbroken phase, so one can't simply integrate them out of the zero temperature theory as before. McLerran *et al.* argue that one can still integrate out the fermions at finite temperature. The point is that in the imaginary time formalism, fermions have only non-zero discrete frequencies, $\omega_n = (2n + 1)\pi T$. Thus if one is interested in phenomena occurring on time and distance scales large compared to T^{-1} , one might expect fermions to be irrelevant. Indeed, some arguments supporting this view were given in ref. 23. If this is correct, one should compute terms in an effective lagrangian arising from quark loops. At lowest order, the top quark (and possibly the b quark) will be the most important. As stressed in ref. 19, the possible operators in this effective lagrangian are not restricted by Lorentz invariance. For example, at dimension six, one can write an operator $\phi_1^* D_o D_i \phi_1 \epsilon_{ijk} F^{jk}$. These authors argued that this includes $n_{CS} \phi_1^* \partial_o \phi_1$. Since $\partial_o \phi_1 \neq 0$, this generates a potential for n_{CS} , and therefore for n_B . They estimated that the resulting baryon asymmetry could easily be consistent with observations.

Several questions have been raised about this analysis. First, just as in the example studied earlier, one must worry that the reaction shuts down for small ϕ . In this model, the problem is potentially even more severe. At small ϕ , one can neglect the quartic terms in the Higgs potential. But the quadratic terms in the potential preserve CP. As a result, one must consider the quartic terms, leading to suppression by additional powers of g . In terms of the parameter σ we introduced earlier, the estimate of ref. 19 may be written as

$$\frac{n_B}{n_\gamma} \sim 10^{-12} \sigma^4 \times (\text{phases, couplings}). \quad (4.8)$$

Clearly, then, for all of these estimates it is necessary to establish the size of σ . McLerran, and also Shaposhnikov, have argued that σ could be large, perhaps as much as 7. This suggestion follows from the fact that $\Gamma(\phi)$ is proportional not only to an exponential factor but to ϕ^7 . However, the expression in eq. (1.11) cannot be correct for very small ϕ , since we know that the rate is non-zero for $\phi = 0$. Consider, instead, a toy model motivated by the instanton picture we described earlier. Take

$$\Gamma = c(\alpha_W T)^{-3.5} \int d\rho \rho^{-8.5} \exp \left[-\beta/\alpha_W (\rho^{-1} + b m^2 \rho) \right] \quad (4.9)$$

★ It is well known that in order to insure absence of flavor changing neutral currents in such a model, one must impose a discrete symmetry which also forbids CP violating terms in the potential. The authors of ref. 19 suggest the possibility that this symmetry is softly broken. Alternatively, one can simply view this model as a prototype for more elaborate theories.

where

$$m^2 = (\alpha_W T)^2 + m_W^2(\phi).$$

The integral over ρ represents the notion that there are trajectories with different scale for passage over the barrier, and the factor in the exponent represents the barrier height. We have added the “magnetic mass” and the symmetry breaking mass in quadrature. The exponents here have been chosen so that the model has the correct behavior for large and small ϕ ; the rate decreases monotonically with ϕ from its maximum at $\phi = 0$. Typically one finds, evaluating this integral numerically for various values of the parameters, that σ is between 2 and 3. Of course, this model can’t be taken too seriously; what is really required, as we stressed earlier, are extensive, improved simulations.

Another question has been raised about the analysis of the two-Higgs model by Cohen, Kaplan and Nelson.³⁴⁾ They note that in fact there is no dimension six operator which is gauge invariant and contains n_{CS} . For example, the operator mentioned above is proportional to $\vec{A} \cdot \vec{B}$, where $\vec{B}$ is the magnetic field. Thus it vanishes at the minima of the potential. It is not then clear what biases the baryon violating transitions. Similar questions will arise in other models, such as the models described earlier, once the mass is small compared to the temperature, if one integrates out the fermions as before.

On the other hand, Cohen *et al.* have performed a different estimate for this model,³⁴⁾ which suggests that the asymmetry which arises may be larger (the connection of the analysis of refs. 34 and 19 is not completely clear), and also raises questions about the validity of integrating out the fermions. They noted that time-varying scalar fields can couple to currents like hypercharge (or left- or right-handed top quark number, neutralino number, etc.). This in turn induces non-zero densities of the corresponding quantities, which in turn bias baryon production. This effect is potentially important and worth further investigation.

All of the discussion up to now has been based on the assumption that the wall is thick and slowly moving. If this is not the case, the process will not be adiabatic and one might hope to generate a larger asymmetry. Indeed, when the wall is thin and rapidly moving, many effects can come into play. Turok and Zadrozny,²⁸⁾ in their seminal paper on this subject, considered precisely such a limit. They argue that the changing Higgs field itself could force the system over the barrier through its couplings to Higgs and gauge fields; CP violation could bias this process. In this picture, there is no obvious suppression as ϕ grows. More recently, Grigoriev, Shaposhnikov and Turok have presented numerical simulations in $1 + 1$ dimension which seem to support this view (somewhat puzzlingly, these authors find that the asymmetries are largest at low temperatures). More work on this aspect of the problem is needed.

However it is hard to see how this mechanism could be relevant to phase transitions of the type considered here. The energy deposited by the moving wall per unit volume is just the internal energy difference between the two phases. This is of order

$$\lambda/4\phi_o^4 \sim 3 \times 10^{-2} T^4 \quad (4.10)$$

for the sorts of Higgs masses which can lead to baryogenesis. Thus the energy in a volume of order the sphaleron size, πM_W^{-3} is roughly of order T , which is much less than the sphaleron energy. This suggests that one must consider biasing of transitions which are already taking place as the wall approaches. A simple-minded estimate suggests that, for a fast-moving wall, this is likely to be ineffective.¹⁸⁾

On the other hand, Cohen, Kaplan and Nelson have proposed still another mechanism which may be relevant to baryon production in this limit.^{30,37)} They argue that one should look for processes which can bias baryon violation in front of the wall, where the rate is unsuppressed. In particular, they consider mechanisms for generating an asymmetry in some (approximately conserved) quantum number in front of the wall. For example, scattering of top quarks from the wall, in a theory with CP violation, can lead to an asymmetry of left vs. right-handed tops in front of the wall. A detailed analysis (described at this meeting by A. Nelson) leads to a substantial asymmetry – as large as 10^{-5} . The asymmetry tends to become small, however, if the wall is slow or if it is much thicker than T^{-1} . We have seen that in the simplest models of the phase transition, the wall tends to be much thicker than this. It would be of some interest to construct theories with such thin walls.

5. Conclusions

From all of this effort, we have learned that the baryon asymmetry may have been created at the electroweak phase transition. However, before reaching the ideal situation where, given a model, we can compute the asymmetry, we need

1. better calculations of the B-violating rates (with and without ϕ),
2. better understanding of the phase transition, and exploration of models with more strongly first order transitions, and
3. better understanding of the processes which generate the asymmetry.

REFERENCES

1. M.E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. **277B** (1992) 324.
2. A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **70B** (1977) 306;
3. S. Dimopoulos and L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D18** (1978) 4500.
4. N. Manton, Phys. Rev. **D28** (1983) 2019; D. Klinkhammer and N. Manton, Phys. Rev. **D30** (1984) 2212.
5. V.A. Kuzmin, V.A. Rubakov and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. **B155** (1985) 36.
6. G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37** (1976) 8; Phys. Rev. **D14** (1976) 3432.
7. T. Banks, M. Dine, G. Farrar, D. Karabali and B. Sakita, Nucl. Phys. **B347** (1990) 581; M. Dine, Santa Cruz preprint SCIPP 90/27 (1990), in Proceedings of 18th SLAC Summer Institute (1990).
8. I. Affleck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **46** (1981) 388.
9. P. Arnold and L. McLerran, Phys. Rev. **D37** (1988) 1020.
10. E. Mottola and A. Wipf, Phys. Rev. **D39** (1989) 588; S. Khlebnikov and M. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. **B308** (1988) 885; M. Dine, O. Lechtenfeld, B. Sakita, W. Fischler and J. Polchinski, Nucl. Phys. **B342** (1990) 381.
11. D. Grigoriev, V. Rubakov and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. **216B** (1989) 172.
12. L. Carson, Xu Li, L. McLerran and R.-T. Wang, Phys. Rev. **D42** (1990) 2127.
13. J. Ambjorn, T. Askgaard, H. Porter and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. **B353** (1991) 346.
14. D.A. Kirzhnits, JETP Lett. **15** (1972) 529; D.A. Kirzhnits and A.D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **42B** (1972) 471.
15. A.D. Linde, *Particle Physics and Inflationary Cosmology* (Harwood, New York, 1990).
16. G. Anderson and L. Hall, Phys. Rev. **D45** (1992) 2685.
17. M. Sher, Phys. Rep. **179** (1989) 273.
18. M. Dine, P. Huet, R. Singleton and L. Susskind, Phys. Lett. **257B** (1991) 351.
19. L. McLerran, M. Shaposhnikov N. Turok and M. Voloshin, Phys. Lett. **256B** (1991) 451.
20. A.D. Linde, Phys. Lett. **70B** (1977) 306; **100B** (1981) 37; Nucl. Phys. **B216** (1983) 421.
21. D. Brahm and S. Hsu, Caltech preprints CALT-68-1705 and CALT-68-1762 (1991) and talk at this meeting.
22. M.E. Shaposhnikov, JETP Lett. **44** (1986) 465; Nucl. Phys. **287** (1987) 757; Nucl. Phys. **299** (1988) 797; A.I. Bochkarev, S. Yu. Khlebnikov and M.E. Shaposhnikov, Nucl. Phys. **B329** (1990) 490.

23. M. Dine, P. Huet, and R. Singleton SCIPP 91/08 (1991).
24. M. Dine, P. Huet, R. Leigh, A. Linde and D. Linde, SLAC-PUB-5740 (1992); SLAC-PUB-5741.
25. M. Dine and J. Bognasco, SCIPP preprint in preparation.
26. M. Gleiser and E. Kolb, FNAL preprint FERMILAB-PUB-91/305-A (1991).
27. N. Tetradis, DESY preprint DESY-91-151.
28. N. Turok, Princeton University preprint PUPT-91-1273.
29. B. Liu, L. McLerran and N. Turok, Minn. preprint TPI-MIN-92-18 (1992).
30. A. Cohen, D. Kaplan and A. Nelson, Phys. Lett. **245 B** (1990) 561.
31. Bochkarev, Kuzmin, Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. **244B** (1990) 275.
32. N. Turok and J. Zadrozny, Nucl. Phys. **B369** (1992) 729.
33. A. Cohen and D. Kaplan, Phys. Lett. **199B** (1987) 251; Nucl. Phys. **B308** (1988) 913.
34. A. Cohen, D. Kaplan and A. Nelson, Phys. Lett. **263B** (1991) 86.
35. N. Turok and J. Zadrozny, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65** (1990) 2331.
36. D. Grigoriev, M.E. Shaposhnikov and N. Turok, Imperial preprint Imperial-TP-92-05 (1992).
37. A. Cohen, D. Kaplan and A. Nelson, UCSD-PTH-91-20 (1991).

FIGURE CAPTIONS

- 1) Potential for analog system with a single degree of freedom. Curvature in the metastable minimum is ω^2 ; the barrier height is V_o .
- 2) Schematic drawing of the potential of a gauge theory as a function of Chern-Simons number. Instanton describes a path in field space from one vacuum to another; the highest point along this path has energy E_b .
- 3) Figure from ref. 11, showing discrete jumps in the Chern-Simons number.
- 4) Detail of one of the jumps. Note that the scalar field unwinds, and develops a zero somewhere.
- 5) One loop diagram which gives rise to ϕ^3 term in the potential.